

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 MARCELO MUTO, NOAH BREEZE,
12 and all others similarly situated,

13 Plaintiff/s,

14 v.

15 FENIX INTERNATIONAL
16 LIMITED; FENIX INTERNET LLC,

17 Defendant/s.
18

No. 5:22-cv-02164-SSS-KKx

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS’
MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING
ON MOTION TO DISMISS [Dkt. 23]**

19
20 The Court is in receipt of Defendants’ “opposed stipulation” [Dkt. 23] to
21 continue the hearing regarding their pending motion to dismiss [Dkt. 16], as well as
22 Plaintiffs’ opposition. First, the Court reminds Defendants that a stipulation, by
23 definition, contains some agreement between the litigants, and that an “opposed
24 stipulation” is properly considered a motion rather than a stipulation.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Construing Defendants' filing as a motion, the Court further notes that
2 Defendants have failed to comply with the requirements set forth in Local Rule 6-1
3 and 7-4. As such, the motion is **STRUCK**. As of this order, the hearing on their
4 motion to dismiss remains on calendar for April 28, 2023 at 2 P.M.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: April 21, 2023



8
9 SUNSHINE S. SYKES
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28